

### Remarks

The Applicant thanks the Office for the careful consideration given the present application in the initial Detailed Action on the merits. With the foregoing amendments and the ensuing remarks, the Applicant has endeavored to respond most properly to each of the points raised by the Office to ensure that the specification and claims now presented are allowable in all respects. With this in mind, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office review and allow the current specification and claims.

In brief summary, the present application was filed with 2 claims in total with claim 1 standing independently. In response to the Office's rejection of claims 1 and 2 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,234,800 to Koyama, claim 1 has been amended to define most clearly over the cited reference and claim 2 has been canceled. Furthermore, claims 3 through 16, each adding patentable limitation to base claim 1, have been added.

As amended, claim 1 requires, among other things, that the claimed platform be mobile and that the control system include "a propulsion arrangement for propelling *the mobile platform* in response to control input from [an] accelerator control." (Emphasis supplied.) Koyama neither discloses nor suggests any propulsion arrangement for propelling *the mobile platform itself* so that the mobile platform and the simulated vehicle retained thereof can move over a support surface. Indeed, Koyama teaches away from a propulsion arrangement for a mobile platform since Koyama clearly contemplates having the simulated vehicle remain still to enable the rider to view the display screen, which is also still. For this reason alone, Applicant's claim 1 is patentable over Koyama.

Amended claim 1 enjoys still further patentability over Koyama based on further limitations in relation to the control system. For example, claim 1 additionally requires "a

steering arrangement for steering the mobile platform in response to control input from the steering arrangement,” which is also nowhere taught or rendered obvious by Koyama. No teaching in Koyama could fairly be said even to contemplate steering *a mobile platform*.

Still further, as amended, claim 1 additionally requires rotatably retained front and rear wheels, which are not found in Koyama. Also, claim 1 now demands that there be “a rear wheel propulsion arrangement for imparting angular velocity to the rear wheel of the simulated two-wheeled vehicle in response to control input from the accelerator control.” Since the two-wheeled vehicle is claimed as being retained by the mobile platform, providing a rotatable rear wheel and a means for rotatably propelling the same, which under Applicant’s invention enables the reproduction of true vehicular performance, is not taught or suggested by the cited art. For these and further reasons, the Applicant most respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Koyama and the remaining prior art.

Newly added claim 3 enjoys patentability over base claim 1 in that it further requires that the “mobile platform comprises an upper platform and a lower platform wherein the upper platform is pivotally retained relative to the lower platform and wherein the two-wheeled vehicle is supported for pivoting with the upper platform.” Nothing in Koyama or any other cited reference could reasonably be considered to teach or suggest such an arrangement.

Even further, claim 4 is nonobvious even as compared to the combined prior art in that it adds inertial sensors to the arrangement for sensing accelerations of the two-wheeled vehicle. Claim 5 enjoys added patentability based its requirement for load sensors operably associated with the two-wheeled vehicle for sensing load distributions, and claim 6 is patentable even over the claims from which it depends because it adds “foot members for engaging feet of a rider and wherein load sensors are operably associated with the foot members for sensing force applied by

a rider.”

Claims 13 through 16, in addition to other limitations, require that the control system impart motion to the platform and the two-wheeled vehicle according to various aspects and equations of Applicant's Theoretical Method of Operation. No cited reference or combination thereof provides any teaching or suggestion of the claimed Method of Operation, particularly when considered in light of the patentable limitations incorporated therein by dependency.

### Conclusion

The Applicant most respectfully submits that the claims now presented are patentable over the cited art. With this in mind, the Office's reconsideration and allowance of the specification and claims 1 and 3 through 16 are respectfully requested.

The Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Detailed Action have been responded to fully. However, if, after consideration of the above amendments and comments, there remain any open issues in this application that possibly can be resolved by a telephone interview, then the Applicant's undersigned attorney most respectfully requests that he be called to discuss and attempt to resolve those issues.

Dated: September 23, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,

/Thomas P. O'Connell/

Thomas P. O'CONNELL, Esq.  
Reg. No. 37,997  
*Attorney for Applicant*  
Customer No. 20738  
(781) 643-1845